AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 10, 2002; BURBANK AIRPORT

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:02am by Mr. Rod Propst, Fullerton Airport.

2. 0 Welcome and Introductions

Attendees were welcomed and introductions were made.

3.0 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4.0: Routine Items

4.1 Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the September 12, 2002 meeting at Fullerton Airport were approved with no comments. Mr. Ron Kochevar, LAWA, motioned for approval and Mr. Keith Downs, Riverside County Airports, seconded the motion.

4.2 ATAC Membership List and Contact Information

There were no changes to the membership list.

5.0 Project Review

There are no submissions for review.

6.0 Information Items

6.1 Burbank Airport Part 161 Study

Mr. Victor Gill, Burbank Airport introduced the Burbank Airport Deputy, Mr. Dan Feger. The Burbank Airport Authority began a process a few years back to do a

Part 161 study. The 1990 Airport Noise and Capacity Act requires that there be a study to justify curfews or other impediments to airport use. The airport has had a voluntary curfew for almost 25 years. The air carriers have largely followed the curfew. Night time noise is probably the single largest problem at the airport.

The airport has completed Phase 1 of the Part 161 study. Phase 1 does a study on baseline noise, forecasting, etc. The alternatives that are being considered include: full night time curfew on operations, night time curfew on departure operations, acceleration of the acoustical treatment program, etc. For each alternative a sensitivity analysis will be performed.

The study went through an extensive public outreach. The most effective way to reach the public was via the internet. The public meetings were not nearly as effective. Part 1 took two to three years to complete because of all the outreach.

The airport has awarded a contract to Landrum and Brown for Phase 2 of the study. Phase 2 looks at the costs and benefits of the measures. In Phase 2 the exact restriction must be selected for approval by the FAA. A comparison is made between the baseline conditions for each alternative. Some of the costs and benefits are straightforward, some are not. Its less clear how to quantify the benefits of quiet, and other quality of life concerns. However, the Part 161 study is designed to be a numeric analysis comparing costs. Phase 2 will likely take one year to complete. Phase 3 will begin after the completion of Phase 2.

The rest of the study will take at least a few more years to complete. The total cost of the Part 161 study is expected to exceed more than $4 million in total. There was community concern that the study was taking too long so Phase 2 will attempt to be streamlined as quick as possible.

A question was asked on what role the FAA has played during the study process. Mr. Dan Feger responded that Burbank and the FAA have been charting new waters with this Part 161 study. No other airport has gotten this far in the process before.

Ms. Paula McHargue, LAWA, asked how Burbank used the internet to solicit public comments. In newspaper ads and at public meetings it was made clear that internet comments are valued as highly as public comments. Also, the airport mailed 150,000 letters to zip codes around the airport. This was fairly inexpensive (given the total cost of the study) and that the results were very good. Attendance at meetings and comments jumped after the mailing.

Mr. Rod Propst asked what methodology was used to define single noise events. Mr. Feger responded that the airport used grid maps that go beyond the 65 CNEL contour. By using grid maps you can look at the impact of single events without drawing a contour. One problem with noise contours is that you have

disenfranchised parties. The contour for eligibility can divide blocks between who gets sound proofing and who doesn't.

6.2 CalTrans Economic Impact Study

Ms. Nancy Benjamin, Caltrans Aeronautics, gave a presentation on the recent developments with the Aviation Economic Impact Study. Included in the agenda is a copy of the working paper 2A. Also available is the working paper 1, which is a summary of government, manufacturing and aerospace contributions to the California economy.

Ms. Benjamin talked about what CalTrans really hopes to accomplish with the project, especially on a limited budget. The approach was to take all the available economic impact studies from the 13 hub airports. Also, surveys were sent to all the non-hub airports in the state. The response rate was about 92%. The final product will go beyond just a numeric impact on the state economy, but will also try to capture how aviation influences people's lives.

Part of the survey examined special topic areas that provide real insight on the role of the airports. There are 16 special topic areas and the report will include vignettes from various airports discussing how specialized the role of airports can be. Some of the special topic areas are: military base conversions, the film and entertainment industries, the wine industry and the importance in providing medical transport and services. Representative airports were picked within the various FAA classifications (primary non-hub, reliever, etc). Not counting the 16 hub airports, 13 others will be profiled in detail. From the SCAG region Camarillo, Corona and Calexico will all be looked at. These 16 airports were picked to show what each type of airport's primary function is, and what economic benefit the airport has on the economy.

The most important issue is how to present the findings that will be easily accessible. There will be an Executive Summary brochure which will have overall statewide economic benefits, the special topic areas and all the hub and non-hub airport profiles. Much greater detail will also be available to interested parties.

Mr. Ron Kochevar, LAWA, asked how the study is dealing with airports that have very old economic impact reports. Ms. Nancy Benjamin said that the hub airports with old studies are working directly with the consultant to get more recent data (Long Beach and Fresno, for example).

6.3 Aviation Task Force Update

Mr. Rod Propst, ATAC Chair, began the discussion. What caught Mr. Propst's attention at the meeting was that the counties are being asked to provide aviation

data to SCAG. Mr. Propst turned the discussion to Mr. Alan Thompson, SCAG staff.

Mr. Thompson began by saying that SCAG President, Mr. Hal Bernson, gave his Presidential charges to the Task Force. The charge is to not reinvent the wheel and use the adopted plan. The changes to the adopted plan will reflect current events (such as Measure W in Orange County, etc).

SCAG will collect data from the counties and ask what is the county's plan for meeting aviation demand? This will be made into an implementation plan based on the regional plan and the decentralized airport system. The next meeting of the Aviation Task Force will be Wednesday, October 23rd at the SCAG offices in downtown Los Angeles.

On October 17th, 2002 is the Aviation Demand Modeling Workshop. Andy McKenzie of Citigroup Technologies will be leading a discussion on the RADAM model. This will be a technical briefing to go over the methodology and assumptions used in SCAG's aviation planning.

Mr. Thompson continued to say that the current list of Aviation Task Force members will be included in the next agenda packet.

A question was asked about how SCAG will implement the plan. Also, will there be legislation similar to AB 2333 which will force counties to supply a share of aviation supply? Mr. Thompson said that his understanding is that it will be done through mutual cooperation between airports.

Ms. Paula McHargue, LAWA, asked which agency in each county would be providing the information on forecasts and master plans? Mr. Thompson replied that each county is organized differently and that the letter would be sent to the appropriate planning and transportation agencies.

Mr. Rich Macias, SCAG, mentioned that SCAG staff is still trying to figure out how to go about collecting the information. It was decided that letters would be sent to the counties and the airport operators to get the information. Also, the development of an implementation plan is a new task for SCAG. The Aviation Task Force will have to help staff develop how to proceed with the implementation role that SCAG has been charged with.

Mr. Rod Propst, concluded the discussion by urging everyone to attend the Aviation Task Force meetings, and also to show up on time.

6.4 Regional Airspace Analysis Update

Mr. Michael Armstrong, SCAG staff began the discussion. SCAG is about to begin an ambitious Regional Airspace Analysis, funded by the FAA. The

resources from the FAA will pay for the modeling of scenarios. Crown Consulting and Citigroup Technologies have been selected to be the consultants for this project. The Notice to Proceed is expected in the next few weeks after the final touches are put on the contracts.

The team will be conducting an analysis of a range of alternatives looking at all airports and military bases in the region. Flight schedules generated by the RADAM model will be fed into the TAAM model. RADAM will be looking at the redistribution of passenger demand given the current economic situation in the United States. Mr. Armstrong turned the discussion over to Dr. Andy McKenzie of Citigroup Technologies.

Dr. McKenzie said that the RADAM model has been in existence for 10 years. Citigroup has invested $7 million in the development. This study is very different because it is looking at air passengers, cargo, charters and general aviation. Also unique is that the TAAM model and RADAM model will be working together. This study will examine the feasibility of different regional aviation alternatives from an airspace point of view. The process will be a loop with the various inputs between RADAM and TAAM until there are no more alternatives.

The initial version of RADAM was primitive. For years the model has grown and the events of September 11 changed a number of attributes. There have been changes in the industry with the fleet mix, scheduling and markets. The current version of the model is also sensitive to inconveniences such as parking, curbside check-in, etc. There have been changes in ground access and not as many last minute passengers. The size of the travelling party has also changed. There are no longer numerous well wishers or greeters. The party size has been reduced to only the number of travelers.

The Airspace Analysis will also cooridnate with the MAGLEV Task Force. The MAGLEV system has some impact on the location of where people will travel to the airport.

Mr. Ron Kochevar, LAWA, asked how changes in technology are included in the forecastng? Mr. Kochevar mentioned the emergence of business jets as an example. Dr. McKenzie responded that there is the possibility of modeling scenarios with more or less corporate aviation.

Mr. Dick Dykas, FAA, asked if MAGLEV will be modeled in all scenarios. Dr. Andy McKenzie said that more or less MAGLEV can be modeled depending on what the Aviation Task Force wants. Mr. Michael Armstrong turned the discussion to Mr. Charlie Aalfs of Crown Consulting.

Mr. Charlie Aalfs, said that Crown Consulting is a Washington DC based consulting firm that has done considerable airspace work on the eastern seaboard. Mr. Aalfs will be the program manager for this project.

TAAM is owned by the Boeing company and can perform a variety of airspace functions. It can model taxiways, runways, air traffic and airspace. It can tell you what type of benefits can be acquired from new runways or taxiways. It is similar to SIMMOD but it is able to go out into the enroute environment.

TAAM creates a baseline model. All of the current airspace structure is included in the model, which was made by the MITRE corporation. TAAM gives you metrics for safety impacts, fixed loading, etc. The TAAM model is also able to show conflicts, etc. This model is the choice of the FAA. The first phase will be fact gathering phase, looking at schedules and the current situation. The second phase will be the future, looking at RADAM forecasts for air travel in 5 year increments out to 2030. The second phase will also include model runs to look for conflicts.

Mr. Michael Armstrong mentioned that although the schedule is two years long, SCAG hopes to have preliminary information in time to feed into the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Mr. Rod Propst asked if there will be interface with the Airspace Working Group (AWG). Mr. Michael Armstrong said that there will be some contact with the AWG and also Airspace Analysis will be forming a Steering Committee of its own. SCAG would like some members of ATAC to take part in the Steering Committee.

Ms. Paula McHargue, LAWA, asked how general aviation will be included in the study? Mr. Michael Armstrong responded that SCAG does have an existing forecast, but that it could be updated. That will be further discussed in the next agenda item.

6.5 General Aviation Survey

Mr. Alan Thompson, SCAG staff, said that SCAG is updating a report that was done a few years ago by Christine Eberhard of CommuniQuest. A few details are being changed to the survey. For example the new version asks: What is the physical capacity of the airport? What are the number of T-Hangars? How many hangars are less that 3,000sq.ft (or, a small corporate aircraft)?

As a hypothetical example, considering John Wayne Airport, if commercial service is to be expanded where would the aircraft go to. Options could include Fullerton or the Inland Empire, but this type of capacity information is what the survey will hope to capture.

Mr. Alan Thompson also brought up the issues at Santa Monica Airport dealing with design capacity and safety. The survey will allow decision makers to be informed about the design standards at each of the SCAG GA airports. The

sample survey is similar to what was provided earlier and Mr. Thompson is looking for comments.

Mr. William Ingraham, San Bernardino County Airports, suggested that the airport's design classification be added. The survey only had the functional classification. Item 6 should be ALP and not CLP.

Mr. William Ingraham, also said that the FAA baseline data should be used instead of the airport's input. The FAA data would be most useful in future scenarios. Rather than asking airports questions like, What is the peak hour? That information can be derived from the FAA data.

7.0 Action Items

None.

8.0 Legislative Report

8.1 Significant Aviation related Legislation before the California Legislature

Mr. Ryan Hall, SCAG staff, mentioned that the most current legislative update was handed out at the beginning of the meeting. The version included in the agenda packet is now outdated.

The Governor's veto message for AB 2333 was accidentially left out of the agenda. Mr. Ryan Hall, SCAG staff, told ATAC that he would email the message out later that day. The emails were sent out the afternoon of 10/10/02.

8.2 Significant Aviation related legislation before the United States Legislature

No report at this meeting.

9.0 Miscellaneous Items

9.1 Press Clippings

There were no comments on the press clippings included in the agenda packet. Mr. Ryan Hall, SCAG, mentioned that if any ATAC members have new articles from their local papers that they would like included to please forward them to Ryan Hall at SCAG.

10.0 Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

11.0 Set Next Meeting Location and Topics for Discussion

The next meeting is Thursday November 14 at San Bernardino International Airport from 10am- 12Noon.

12.0 Adjournment

Mr. Rod Propst adjourned the meeting at 11:35am.

ATAC Members Present:

Benjamin, Nancy	CalTrans Aeronautics
Downs, Keith	Riverside County Airports
Dykas, Richard	FAA
Gustin, Ted	Los Angeles County Airports
Harrison, Milford	San Bernardino International Airport
Ingraham, William	San Bernardino County Airports
Jenkins, James	Chino Airport
Kochevar, Ron	LAWA
Kranenburg, Mark	San Bernardino County Airports
McCusker, Justin	John Wayne Airport
McHargue, Paula	LAWA
Propst, Rod	Fullerton Airport (Chair)
Samad, Sam	FAA
Smith, Tahirih	CalTrans